

Application No. 10/713,784  
Response to Office Action of September 12, 2006

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P17931  
TC/A.U. P2189

### **Remarks**

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1-2, 16-23, and 27-31 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 3, 5-6, 9, 11-15, and 25-26 have been amended. No claims have been added or withdrawn. Thus, claims 3-15 and 25-26 remain pending in the application.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 3-4, 10, 15, and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim any intervening claims.

### **Claim Rejections § 102**

Claims 1-2, 5, 9, 11, 16-19, 21-25, 27, and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,062,597 issued to Perego et al. (*Perego*). Claims 1-2, 16-19, 21-24, 27, and 29-31 have been cancelled without prejudice and, thus, the rejection of claims 1-2, 16-19, 21-24, 27, and 29-31 moot. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 9, 11, and 25 are not anticipated by *Perego* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 5, 9, and 11 have been amended to depend, directly or indirectly, from amended claim 3. Similarly, claim 25 has been amended to depend from amended claim

Application No. 10/713,784  
Response to Office Action of September 12, 2006

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P17931  
TC/A.U. P2189

26. Claims 3 and 26 have been amended to include the limitations of the base claim from which they previously depended as well as any intervening claims. The Office action indicates that, as amended, claims 3 and 26 are allowable. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 9, 11, and 25 are not anticipated by *Perego*.

#### Claim Rejections § 103

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Perego*. Claim 13 depends from amended claim 3 and includes the limitations of claim 3 (and any intervening claims). The Office action indicates that claim 3, as amended, is allowable. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is patentable over *Perego*.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Perego* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,523,098 issued to Anderson (*Anderson*). Claim 14, as amended, depends from amended claim 3 and includes the limitations of claim 3 (and any intervening claims). The Office action indicates that claim 3, as amended, is allowable. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is patentable over *Perego* in view of *Anderson*.

Claims 6-8 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Perego* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,820,087 issued to Langendorf (*Langendorf*). Claim 20 has been cancelled without prejudice and, thus, the rejection of claim 20 is

Application No. 10/713,784  
Response to Office Action of September 12, 2006

Atty. Docket No. 042390.P17931  
TC/A.U. P2189

moot. Claim 6-8 depend from claim 3 and include the limitations of claim 3 (and any intervening claims). The Office action indicates that claim 3, as amended, is allowable. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-8 are patentable over *Perego* in view of *Langendorf*.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Perego* in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2005/0262295 issued to Nataraj et al. (*Nataraj*). Claim 12, as amended, depends from amended claim 3 and includes the limitations of claim 3 (and any intervening claims). The Office action indicates that claim 3, as amended, is allowable. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is patentable over *Perego* in view of *Nataraj*.

Application No. 10/713,784  
Response to Office Action of September 12, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
Docket No. 042390.P17931  
TC/A.U. P2189

JAN 09 2007

**Conclusion**

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2007

/Philip A. Pedigo/  
Philip A. Pedigo  
Reg. No. 52,107  
Attorney for Intel Corporation

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor, & Zafman LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 712-5560 or (502) 439-8778